

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. The examiner has objected the specification and claims 1 and 18. Furthermore, the examiner has rejected claims 1- 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112 and rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lazzarotto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,782,245).

In response to the objection, the specification and claims 1 and 18 have been amended to overcome the objection. Moreover, the specification has been carefully examined to avoid other errors. It is requested this objection be withdrawn.

In response to 112 rejection, claim 1 has been amended to disclose the secondary module is connected to the primary module using a transmission interface. Therefore, this rejection is requested to be withdrawn.

In response to 102 rejection, claims 1, 7 and 18 have been amended to disclose a secondary receiving module of a receiver capable of unplugging or disconnecting from a primary receiving module of the receiver so that when the primary receiving module is connected to a host computer, the secondary receiving module can be connected to another host computer.

However, in Fig. 6B of Lazzarotto et al., elements 604 and 605 are connected to a USB hub 610 which is used to connect with a host or other USB devices. Nowhere in Lazzarotto et al. discloses the elements 604 and 605 can be separated and individually used for two different host computers. It is obvious that the USB hub 610 can be corresponding to a transmission plug and/or a transmission slot disclosed in Applicant's claims 2, 4, 9, 13 and 14. That is, Lazzarotto et al. does not disclose a transmission interface, such as USB, including a slot and a plug matching the slot of Applicant's claims 5, 6, 16, 17, 19 and 20.


Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. As stated in MPEP §2131:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

(Emphases added).

If the Examiner believes that a further telephonic interview will facilitate allowance of the claims, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (610) 446-5886. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

By 
Kao H. Lu, Esquire
Registration No. 43,761
(610) 446-5886

686 Lawson Ave
Havertown, Pa 19083